

**Brightwater Treatment Facility  
Executive Advisory Committee  
Meeting Sixteen  
Northshore Utility District  
March 21, 2002  
MEETING REPORT**

**Committee Members**

Bill Anderson  
Bob Bandarra  
Peter Block  
Deborah Chase  
Peter Coates  
David Nunnallee (for K. Fitzpatrick)  
Gary Haakenson  
Peter Hahn  
Corinne Hensley  
Mary Hovander  
Doug Jacobson  
Scott Jepsen  
Wayne Kaske  
Gwenn Maxfield  
Paul McIntyre  
Mike Miller  
Mick Monken (for P. Rose)  
Tom Putnam

**King County Staff**

Michael Popiwny  
Debra Ross  
Gunars Sreibers  
Christie True

**Norton-Arnold & Janeway**

Yvonne Kraus

**Observers:**

Jim Orvis  
Gil Nash  
April MacFie

**Facilitator:** Margaret Norton-Arnold

## **Introduction**

Margaret Norton-Arnold welcomed members to their sixteenth meeting. The name of the committee has been changed to the Executive Advisory Committee (EAC) to better reflect their role of advising both county executives on a broad range of policy questions and issues throughout the year. The committee will not be asked to recommend a site or system. New committee members were welcomed to the group, and all members introduced themselves to each other.

Michael Popiwny provided an overview and anticipated timeline for the Brightwater project throughout 2002. Highlights are the new community task forces, which will convene for the first time in April, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process, which will be initiated in May, and community design workshops, which will begin in the summer. The project is still on-track for a final decision by King County Executive Ron Sims in early 2003.

## **Committee Discussion: Scope of Work and Ground Rules**

Members discussed the 2002 draft work plan and ground rules. As a result of this discussion, a revised 2002 work plan and ground rules is attached to this meeting report. The committee also asked that its work plan and ground rules be posted on the Brightwater website.

## **Committee Brainstorming: Major Questions to be Addressed**

The committee spent the bulk of the meeting in a brainstorming session centered on the major questions they would like to see answered throughout the remainder of the Brightwater site selection process. These questions will serve as the basis for the in 2002.

The list of questions includes:

- ❑ Reclaimed water: the whole discussion needs to include a number of issues beyond technology. For example, where are the customers? How much will it cost? How will it be conveyed? Will subsidies be required? Should satellite plants be used to distribute it? Is it viable to use reclaimed water to augment stream flows? What could be future mandatory requirements regarding reclaimed water?
- ❑ Is tertiary treatment an option? If tertiary is not an option now, how can the plant be designed with enough flexibility to incorporate tertiary treatment if it becomes a regulatory requirement in the future?
- ❑ Conveyance construction options and methods, for example, issues around tunneling vs. cut-and-cover. What is the difference in cost, feasibility and overall impacts of these different methods? Are there opportunities to construct conveyance in conjunction with Washington State Department of Transportation's plans for widening SR 522 and SR 9 or other projects? Do opportunities exist to utilize existing piping?
- ❑ What is the plan for public involvement related to the conveyance system? Will it be similar to the level of effort that has been underway for the treatment plant site itself?

- ❑ Is it possible to retire the existing Edmonds plant altogether or transition it to a water reclamation plant? Would such options save money for the City of Edmonds?
- ❑ Opportunities for joint uses should be investigated. What joint uses aren't appropriate? The community task forces should also be involved in joint use decisions.
- ❑ To what extent will King County employ sustainable building practices in the construction of the facility? This should be a requirement, not an option.
- ❑ What impacts will Brightwater have on surrounding land uses? Will rezoning be necessary? What are the impacts on tax revenue bases?
- ❑ What are the overall impacts of Brightwater on the residents in the surrounding areas? And, what will the impacts be during construction?
- ❑ Cost is an important issue. What are the impacts in terms of cost to the ratepayers? What are the opportunities for cost savings in the public bidding process for design and construction of the plant?
- ❑ What are the opportunities for stream restoration/enhancement and wildlife habitat enhancement?
- ❑ What are the opportunities to reduce stormwater/toxic loads at plant?
- ❑ Are there ways to avoid problems with federal regulations?
- ❑ Plant design is important, not only in terms of technology but also in terms of aesthetics. All possible components of plant design should be addressed.
- ❑ To what extent should King County rely on emerging technologies versus the 'tried and true technologies'? Use of emerging technologies needs to be looked at carefully. We don't want to be the first region in the world to use an unproven technology.
- ❑ How will concurrency standards be met, both during construction and once the plant is in place? Future growth of region beyond 2050 – it is important to look at the life expectancy of plant and potential future wastewater needs; do opportunities exist to plan for/allow flexibility for future facilities or service area needs?

This list of questions will be incorporated into the committee work plan.

#### **Committee Discussion: Public Involvement Plan**

The Committee had reviewed the 2002-2003 Brightwater public involvement plan in advance of the meeting, and had the following comments on the plan:

- ❑ In response to a question about how the size of the “public” is determined for certain aspects of the project (e.g. conveyance), Michael answered that everyone within at least

300 feet of any of the proposed conveyance routes would be notified of the public meetings related to the EIS process.

- ❑ It would be good to involve the EAC in decisions related to public opinion polling: when, what types of questions, and the geographic area that will be covered.
- ❑ King County should work closely with all of the cities that might have websites, government access channels, newsletters and other public involvement tools to make sure that all meeting announcements and other information are included in these outlets. This would be an effective way to get the word out about the project.
- ❑ Make sure that you have a comprehensive list of all of the daily and weekly newspapers in the area; people really pay attention to those.
- ❑ When King County refers to meetings it has held with the public in news releases or other materials, it would be helpful to include the meeting dates and locations in this information.

Michael Popiwny asked committee members to share information on groups that may be interested in having a presentation on Brightwater or should be added to the Brightwater mailing list, especially as outreach begins related to the potential conveyance routes. He also asked that committee members submit suggestions on the kinds of topics that they would like to see included in the newsletter.

### **Next Steps**

The next EAC meeting will be held on Thursday, April 11, 2:00 p.m., at the Northshore Utility District. The meeting will focus on conveyance issues associated with the Brightwater project.